Title II Project Application for 2002 Funds Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project	Name: Fishery Biologist Support	2. County: Douglas			
3. Project	Sponsor: Umpqua Basin Watershed Council	4. Date: 5/24/02			
5. Sponsor	's Phone Number: 673-5756				
6. Sponsor	's E-mail: ubwc@yahoo.com				
7. Project	Location (attach project area map)				
a. Description	on of Location: Umpqua River (See attached map for n	nore details)			
	Watershed Name: All in the Umpqua Basin				
c. 5 th Field V	Vatershed Name: All in the Umpqua Basin				
d. Legal Location: Township Range Section(s) All within the Umpqua Basin					
e. BLM District Roseburg, Coos Bay, e. BLM Resource Area all in the Umpqua Basin					
Medford					
f. State / Pri	vate / Other lands involved? X Yes No				
Q Duningt	Goals and Objectives: (Describe the goals and objectives of the				
benefit from the	e project)	e project. If applicable list species that will			
	o fund the joint Watershed Council/ODFW fish big	ologist from 7/1/03 through			
6/30/05 who will;					
⇒ Develop opportunities for restoration as knowledge about and interest in watershed					
restoration increases; Contact private landowners and develop 12 more restoration projects					
per year;					
⇒ Serve on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in support of the Council and all					
committee members;					
⇒ Continue to facilitate meetings and provide technical support to the Umpqua Basin Fish					
Access Team (UBFAT);					
⇒ Staff outreach displays and events, and participate in landowner workshops in support of					
the Council and ODFW;					
⇒ Support and work with Salmon/Trout Enhancement Project (STEP) volunteers on fish					
project		20 TAC.			
Report regularly on accomplishments to the Council and the TAC;					
⇒ Provide monitoring services for watershed council projects (this includes stream habitat, presence/absence and spawning surveys);					
⇒ Provide implementation and effectiveness monitoring of projects; and					
⇒ Serve as technical liaison, representing the council and ODFW when working on					
	collaborative projects on private and federal ownership.				

Even though the Umpqua Basin is one of the largest basins in western Oregon, technical support to fisheries is a limiting factor. The number of fish biologists from ODFW, BLM and FS are down considerably from 10 years ago and their capability to offer support to the

08/19/02 Page 1 of 6

9. Project Description: (Describe how the project will be conducted and how its goals and objectives will be met.)

Title II Project Application for 2002 Funds Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

council is stretched thin by declining budgets and expanded workload.

The council has been able for the past 4 years to procure OWEB funding for one biologist, Sam Dunnavant, who is shared between ODFW and the Council. His work has been exemplary. He has developed numerous instream LWD/boulder, fencing, planting and stock water projects over the past four years. He has also implemented a large number of culvert replacements on private lands to improve fish passage. He has headed up the Umpqua Basin Fish Access Team and is involved in other watershed programs, such as speaking at the landowner meetings of the watershed assessments. OWEB funding support for this position will end 6/30/03. ODFW has provided administrative support as an in-kind match for the past four years. The agency is facing a declining budget and future support for this position lies in the hands of the 2003/2005 legislative budget process.

Limiting factors to anadromous fish survival in the basin are water quality and degraded or non-existent fish habitat. If the council is to address these factors by implementing restorative actions, qualified technical assistance is crucial. With threatened species of fish, we can't afford to fail in this effort. Sam's recent successes creating fish habitat by placing large wood in streams is evident by increasing populations of fish. His efforts at replacing fish passage culverts have opened up miles of formerly inaccessible habitat to salmon and trout. Riparian corridors are recovering since livestock have been excluded by fencing and trees and shrubs are now free to grow and provide shade and detritus and at some later date, large wood to the stream.

- 10. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? Stakeholder relationships and trust have been increasing exponentially as watershed council partners in the BLM, FS, other state and federal agencies, industrial timber and private landowners have begun to look at restoration on a broader scale. Sam himself has been integral to building these relationships and is preferred for projects by the major timber companies in the Umpqua Basin. Boundaries between landowners are becoming more transparent as all parties take a watershed scale view of restoration. Projects are being developed that encompass entire sub-watersheds. This shared biologist position provides a technical bridge between private and federal ownership.
- 11. How is this project in the best public interest and how will it benefit communities?

 The UBWC is one of the largest and most successful watershed councils in the State working in support of the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. Our success would be severely diminished if we were unable to secure this technical support for our fish restoration efforts. Sam assists council staff in setting up contracts for the various projects. We attempt to use only contractors from Douglas County, which benefits the local communities.

08/19/02 Page 2 of 6

Title II Project Application for 2002 Funds Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

12. Who will accomplish the project?				
Contractor	Federal Workforce			
County Workforce	Volunteers			
Other (specify): A joint UBWC/ODFW fish biol	ogist			
13. Is this project coordinated with other related	project(s) on adjacent lands?			
Yes No (If yes, then describe)				
As mentioned above, watershed council proje	ects cross all boundaries. We work			
collaboratively with BLM, FS, Industrial Timber and other private landowners to				
implement projects that benefit fish and wa	ter quality on a watershed scale.			
14. If the project is on private land how does it	· ·			
Similar to #13, this project will allow the council to work across boundaries in				
support of activities on private and fede				
support of dottitios on private and road	Tal lands.			
15. Measure of Project Accomplishments				
a. Total Acres: N/A	b. Total Miles:N/A			
c. Number of Structures: N/A	d. Estimated Number of People Reached			
e. Number of Laborer Days: Funding is being	(for environmental education and workforce training			
sought for one person for two years.	projects): 100/year (speaking at meetings,			
	working at fairs)			
f. Other (specify):				
g. Describe how long will the benefits of the project las	t: July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005			
16 XX/91 (1) 1 (1) (1)	• 1.0			
16. Will the project generate merchantable materials?				
Yes No If yes, describe	:			
17. How does the proposed project meet purpose	es of the legislation? (Check at least one)			
 ☐ Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. ☐ Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. 				
Restores and improves land health.				
1				
Restores water quality.				
18. Project Type (Check at least one)				
Road Maintenance	☐ Trail Maintenance			
Road Decommission/Obliteration	☐ Trail Obliteration			
Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify):				
Soil Productivity Improvement	Forest Health Improvement			
_	☐ Control of Noxious Weeds			
*				
Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): Soil Productivity Improvement	Soil Productivity Improvement Watershed Restoration & Maintenance Fish Habitat Restoration Control of Noxious Weeds Reestablish Native Species			

08/19/02 Page 3 of 6

Title II Project Application for 2002 Funds Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

19. Project Initiation and Estimated Completion	Dates: (Describe the timing of the ma	ajor phases of the project)	
Start date: July 1, 2003			
End date: June 30, 2005			
20. Status of Project Planning Not Applical	ble		
a. NEPA process complete:	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A	
If no, give est. date of completion:			
c. NMFS consultation complete:	Yes No	N/A	
d. USFWS consultation complete:	☐ Yes ☐ No	N/A	
e. Survey & Manage complete:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Not Applicable	
f. DSL/ODFW* permits for in-stream work obtained:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Not Applicable	
g. DSL/COE* 404 fill/removal permit obtained:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Not Applicable	
h. SHPO* concurrence received:	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Not Applicable	
i. Project design(s) completed:	☐ Yes ☐ No		
* DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Department	of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army (Corps of Engineers,	
SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer			
21. Anticipated Project Costs			
a. Total fiscal year 2002 Title II funds requested (to be e	expended beginning in FY 2003):	\$7,946	
	(47,6	575 from 4 RACs)	
b. Is this a multi-year project? ✓ Yes ☐ No			
Display estimated expenditures by fiscal year below (The federal fisc	cal year begins October 1):		
d. FY 2003 expenditures: \$7,945	f. FY 2005 expenditures:		
e. FY 2004 expenditures:	g. FY 2007 expenditures:		

08/19/02 Page 4 of 6

Title II Project Application for 2002 Funds Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis (Includes all expenditures for the life of the project)

Item	Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution	Requested County Title II Contribution	Other Contributions	Total Available Funds
Field Work & Site Surveys				
NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation				
Permit Acquisition				
Project Design & Engineering				
Contract Preparation				
Contract Administration				
Contract Cost				
Workforce Cost		95,350	31,784	127,134
		(Roseburg BLM -		
		31,784)		
		(Coos Bay BLM -		
		31,784)		
		(Medford BLM -		
		15,891)		
		(FSRogue/Umpqua-		
		15,891)		
Materials & Supplies		.5,5,1)		
Monitoring				
Other				
Total Cost Estimate		95,350	31,784	127,134

22. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above:				
Roseburg BLM RAC	\$31,784			
Rogue/Umpqua RAC	\$15,891			
Coos Bay BLM RAC	\$31,784			
Medford BLM RAC	\$15,891			
ODFW base budget or other.	\$31,784			

08/19/02 Page 5 of 6

Title II Project Application for 2002 Funds Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

23. Monitoring Plan

a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

The ODFW Umpqua Watershed District Biologist will be the supervisor for this position. Employee oversight is also provided by the watershed council executive director.

b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well it contributes to local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

This project will employ one professional fish biologist for a two-year period.

c. What methods will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?
N/A

24. What are the analyses, plans, legislation, or other supporting documents that support and guide this application? (E.g. the Northwest Forest Plan, a watershed analysis, a late successional reserve assessment, or the Oregon Plan for Salmon.)

The charge of the UBWC is to improve water quality and fish habitat. The Governor and the legislature have thrown their support behind the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. The Measure 66 lottery funds through OWEB which currently fund this position and 8 other biologists as well, will expire June 30, 2003.

25. Who are the key people responsible for this project? (List their names and titles)

Bob Kinyon: Executive Director, UBWC

Dave Loomis: District Fish Biologist, Roseburg office of ODFW

26. Attach a map and photograph(s) of the project (At a minimum, the map should show the project location, roads, and streams, and private versus BLM ownership. The photograph should show the project site or a representative portion of it. A digital photograph in .jpg format is preferred, but a hard copy will suffice.

08/19/02 Page 6 of 6